constituted by Government is under modification and is expected to be ready by July 1938. As such, no details can be furnished till the modified project is prepared and scrutinised.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—How long have negotiations been going on with the Madras Government?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—For some years past.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—Has any settlement been arrived at?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—No; the matter is still under correspondence.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—When is it likely to be settled?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is difficult to say that, seeing that the interests of two or three Governments are concerned in it.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—Is there any truth in the report that the Mysore Government have arrived at a satisfactory settlement of the question with Madras?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is too early to say anything.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—What is the estimated cost of the project?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—The estimate is under preparation.

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—How is the cost proposed to be met?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—When the estimate itself is not ready, how can we go into the ways and means of financing the scheme?

Mr. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY.—How many acres will be irrigated when the project is completed?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—All that can be said at present is that it is a project costing about Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 crores. It is not possible to furnish more details at this stage.

Disposal of Subjects not discussed in the Assembly.

Q.—32. **Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA** (Tirthahalli Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) what is the total number of resolutions and representations that were not taken up for discussion in each of the six sessions of the Representative Assembly from June 1934 including October 1936;

(*b*) have Government taken any action in respect of those resolutions and representations?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar).**—

(*a*) The subjoined table furnishes the required information:—

	Reslns.	Repns.
1934—		
Budget Session ...	6	66
Dasara „ ...	25	121
1935—		
Budget „ ...	13	78
Dasara „ ...	32	143
1936—		
Budget „ ...	20	102
Dasara „ ...	30	151

(*b*) Attention is invited to Government Order No. Rl. 124-87—R. A. 13-35-1, dated 12—17th September 1935, passing orders regarding the disposal of representations, questions and resolutions tabled for discussion in the Representative Assembly but not taken up. A copy of the Government Order is placed on the Table. (*Vide* Appendix.)

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA.—With reference to answer to (*b*), how are the undiscussed subjects to be disposed of?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—They must be brought up at another session.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA.—Is it not possible to modify the existing order on the subject so that representations not discussed might be taken up by the Government for consideration?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It is not possible to do so.

Mr. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—When the same questions are brought up for consideration at a subsequent session, will the Government at least give precedence to them over questions coming up for the first time?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It is in the hands of the members themselves to do so. They can give preference to such questions at the district meetings themselves.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that subjects sent up by the members from the malnad generally lapse?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Is it difficult for the Government to furnish printed answers to questions not actually taken up for discussion?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—As members can repeat them at another session, there is no need to furnish printed answers.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Will not such an arrangement enable the members to tackle fresh questions at each session instead of dealing with the old ones?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It is left to the members to raise such questions as they consider important.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—What is the percentage of questions and representations actually discussed in the Assembly?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET—*contd.*

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA said that the budget under discussion was really not a surplus budget, as claimed by the Government, since in balancing it they had entrenched upon the interest on the Famine Insurance Fund to the tune of Rs. 3 lakhs. This amount had to be legitimately credited to the corpus of the fund itself. Its utilisation could have been justified if it had been for protective works calculated to avert famine, such as for restoration of tanks.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevanipuna S. SHAMANNA) explained that the utilisation of the interest on this fund was not a recent innovation, but had been continuing for a large number of years, and even for spending it for the purposes mentioned it would be necessary to first credit it to the revenue side. More than this amount was spent on irrigation and tank works. To give only one example, Government had sanctioned Rs. 5 lakhs for the Marconahalli reservoir for expenditure in the year 1937-38.

Messrs. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA and T. MADIAH GOWDA said that there would be no objection to the step taken provided that the additional income under land revenue, as a result of the Marconahalli project would in future be credited to the Famine Insurance Fund and not to the general revenues.

Mr. S. SHAMANNA replied that according to the budget system, particular items of revenue could not be earmarked for particular purposes.

Continuing, **Mr. MADIAH GOWDA** remarked that the anticipations of the Government with regard to land revenue collections for the budget year appeared to be too sanguine to be realised. No doubt the receipts during the current year were more than the budget estimates, but there was no guarantee that the same would be the case in the following year also. And even during the current year, the high percentage of collection was mostly due to the coercive steps freely and mercilessly resorted to by the revenue authorities of late, causing untold misery and hardship to the helpless raiyats. He felt that such a state of affairs, if allowed to continue, would only lower the reputation of the Government. Local officers were devoting all their time and energy for improving collections instead of bestowing due attention on other activities resulting in public good. The Government were too optimistic in anticipating a large realisation from land revenue under the existing economic condition of the raiyat. The budget also provided for large receipts under Notice, Isthihar and Jafti fees, contrary to the promises made by the Government in the past that such penal levies would be dispensed with as far as possible. He implored the Government to bear in mind that generally no raiyat would be unwilling to pay the land revenue which he was due to pay. If anyone did not pay, it always meant that he was unable to pay. Still, the Government went on bringing lands to auction for arrears of land revenue and if in such cases the owners entered upon their lands, *takrar takhtas* would at once be filed. The fact that an income of Rs. 2 lakhs under